

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-10 are pending. Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as anticipated by Escobar et al. U.S. patent No. 5,826,102 ("Escobar") in view of Puri Et al. U.S. patent No. 6,134,269 ("Puri")

Applicants' Reply

Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejection of claims 1-10, which have been amended to clarify the invention.

Applicants' invention relates to not merely to the use of object-based structures in audio-visual transmission and display, but relates to the use of the parametric bitstream structure to convey the scene description information, coupled with the timing information (decoding, composition, and expiration timestamps). (See e.g., specification, Summary of Invention, page 1 lines 26- page 2 line 10, etc.).

Applicants note that conventional or prior art audio/visual architecture (e.g., MPEG-4) includes general definitions of object-based structures, but does not show or suggest how composition of the objects is supposed to take place. In applicants' invention (see e.g., independent claims 1, 8, 9 and 10), composition information is streamed along with audiovisual/video objects information in a data bit stream, for example, from a transmitter/server to a receiver/client. The receiver/client processes the composition information received in the data bitstream to compose scenes from the received objects.

Neither Escobar nor Puri show or suggest applicants' claimed invention of "pushing" both object information and composition information from server to client, so that the client "passively" receives both information to compose scenes.

Unlike applicants' invention, Escobar does not disclose sending or streaming composition information from the server to the client. Escobar describes using edit decision lists (EDL) and interactive decision lists (IDL), which capture the editing decisions made by a user of [an] authoring tool to control of playback or execution of the objects. (See e.g., col. 4 lines 24-36). Escobar describes storing IDL/EDL as an application as an ASCII file. (See e.g., col. 10 lines 52-55). As such, Escobar clearly does not disclose streaming of composition information (or even IDL/EDLs) for use in composing scenes at the client/receiver. Applicants additionally note that in Escobar, the IDL is read at the client, and then "send commands" are issued to the server to retrieve the object from the assets. (See e.g., col. 11 lines 2-10). This makes clear that: a) the IDL (e.g., an ASCII file) is not streamed item by item, but is available in its entirety at the client; and b) the objects are not streamed in a "push" fashion, but rather retrieved (in what is called "pull"). In this context, applicants again note that in Escobar, the client retrieves object data, which is not independently streamed by the server. (See e.g., Abstract and claim 1: "a user input device . . . for retrieving from the one or more file servers and for playing back or executing at least one object at a relative time represented on the interactive multimedia application").

Thus, Escobar does not show or suggest the steps of "streaming in data bit stream, over time, a plurality of audiovisual/video objects and composition information for the objects, to a receiver," and then at the receiver, "processing the composition information received in the

data bitstream to compose scenes from the received objects,” which steps are required by applicants’ method claim 1 and implemented by apparatus claims 8, 9 and 10.

As correctly noted by the Examiner, the other cited reference — Puri, relates to “encoding of objects.” (See Puri Abstract, col. 3. lines 12-19, and col. 4 lines 38-39. etc.). However, Puri does not show or suggest streaming both object information and composition information to a receiver. In particular, like Escobar, Puri does not show or suggest the steps of “streaming in data bit stream, over time, a plurality of audiovisual/video objects and composition information for the objects, to a receiver,” and then at the receiver, “processing the composition information received in the data bitstream to compose scenes from the received objects.”

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 8, 9 and 10 are patentable over the cited references — Escobar and Puri, whether viewed independently or in combination. Further, claims 2-7 that depend from claim 1 also are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the prior art rejections of claims 1-10 should be withdrawn.”

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of which are requested.

If there are any remaining issues to be resolved, applicants request that the Examiner kindly contact the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview for quick resolution of those issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Manu J. Tejwani
PTO Reg. No. 37,952

Attorney for Applicants
Baker Botts L.L.P
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
212-408-2614